A N

ACCOUNT

Of all the Conſiderable

Books and *Pamphlets*

That have been wrote on either Side

In the CONTROVERSY

CONCERNING THE

TRINITY,

Since the YEAR MDCCXII.

In which is alſo contained,

An Account of the PAMPHLETS

Writ this laſt Year on each Side by the

DISSENTERS,

To the End of the YEAR, MDCCXIX.

London, Printed for JAMES KNAPTON, at the *Crown*, in St. *Paul*'s Church-Yard, 1720.

Price Six-Pence.

AN ACCOUNT, &c.

All the first part that are marked are in a Bundle of Dr Clarke

THERE has been lately publiſhed an Account of all the Conſiderable Pamphlets that have been printed the laſt three Years in the Bp of *Bangor*'s Controverſy concerning Authority in Religious Matters. During the ſame Time a Controverſy of a ſomething different Nature, but of as great Moment, concerning the Right Faith in the Article of the Trinity, and the Neceſſity of ſuch a Faith to Salvation, has been debated with equal Warmth: An Account of which will not be leſs agreeable than *that* of the other Controverſy.

It is neceſſary to go ſomething further back in *this* Account; which I ſhall commence with That incomparable Book publiſhed by Dr *Clarke* in 1712, entitled,

I. 'The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity in Three 'Parts. Wherein all the Texts of the New Teſta-'ment, relating to that Doctrine, and the principal 'Paſſages in the Liturgy of the Church of *England* 'are collected, compared and explained. By *Sam.* 'Clarke, D. D.

Againſt this ſeveral Pamphlets were written, but none by Men of any Character, or worth the leaſt Notice, till Dr *Wells* publiſhed

II. 'Remarks on Dr *Clarke*'s Introduction to his Scrip-

'ture Doctrine of the Trinity. By *Edw. Wells*, D. 'D. Dated *May* 30. 1713.

Dr *Wells* indeed excuses himself from answering *the Book it self*, because He says a sufficient Answer had been published, entitled, 'The True Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity.

But Dr *Clarke* in

III. 'A Letter to the Reverend Dr *Wells* in Answer to 'his Remarks, by *Sam. Clarke*, D. D.

After observing that till Dr *Wells*'s Book, nothing had been published against Him but unintelligible Pamphlets; has shewn by several select Passages out of *this*, that it is a Book wrote by some Rosecrucian Author, turning all Religion into manifest Ridicule. Tho' that Book really does so, yet no doubt it was not so designed by the Author, who has published other Pamphlets which shew him to be a Man whom Religion has made Serious and Inquisitive, but who withal has the Unhappiness of writing in a way so like Enthusiasm, that as no one thinks it worth while to answer what he has written, so neither do I think it so to take notice of any other of his Writings. He would be very ill employed who should read all the Trash of this kind that has been printed since Dr *Clarke*'s Book was written; and therefore it can answer no End to give any Account of them, if any Person had been so curious an Observer as to be able to do it. I do not pretend to make this Account extend to such: All the Ends of it will be answered, if it comprehends all those on each Side, who have any the least Reputation among either Party. This is all I undertake, and in this I believe I shall not much fail.

To Dr *Clarke*'s Answer, Dr *Wells* replyed, *Dec.* 5. 1713, in

IV. 'A Letter to the Reverend Dr *Clarke*, in Answer 'to his Letter to Dr *Wells*. By *Edw. Wells*, D. D.

About the same time was published,

V. 'The Scripture Doctrine of the most Holy and Un-'divided Trinity vindicated against the Misrepresen-'tations of Dr *Clarke*. To which is prefixed a Let-'ter to the Reverend Doctor, by *Rob. Nelson*, Esq.

The Book is *said* to be writ by *James Knight*, now D. D.

D. Vicar of St. *Sepulchres*, then Fellow of St *John*'s Coll. *Oxf.*

The Biſhop of *Cheſter* (Dr *Gaſtrell*) alſo publiſhed

VI. ' Remarks on Dr *Clarke*'s Scripture Doctrine of the ' Trinity, by the Author of " Some Conſiderations " concerning the Trinity, and the Ways of managing " that Controverſy.

The Book referred to, was printed in 1702; and a 3d Edit. in 1707, with a Vindication of it annexed, in Anſwer to an Eſſay concerning the Uſe of Reaſon.

To theſe Two Dr *Clarke* replyed in

VII. 'A Reply to the Objections of *Rob. Nelſon*, Eſq; and ' of an Anonymous Author againſt Dr *Clarke*'s Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity. Being a Commentary ' on 40 ſelect Texts of Scripture. To which is added, ' An Anſwer to the Remarks of the Author of ſome ' Conſiderations, &c. By *Sam. Clarke*, D. D. (See ' No. 18.)

In this Book, p. 213, Dr *Clarke* takes notice of Dr *Wells*'s Letter, as wholly referring to other modern Authors, whoſe Arguments the Dr had anſwered in his firſt Book; and of his writing in ſo particular a Style and Manner, that it could not be thought the Dr was under any Obligation to have any further Controverſy with him.

On Dr *Clarke*'s Side were alſo publiſhed,

VIII. ' A Diſcourſe ſhewing that the *Antenicene* Fathers ' Expoſitions of the Texts alleged againſt Dr *Clarke* ' by a learned Layman [Mr *Nelſon*'s Friend,] are ' more agreeable to the Interpretations of Dr *Clarke*, ' than to the Interpretations of that learned Layman.

This is ſaid to be by Dr *Whitby*. In the End of it, a Reply to Dr *Bull*'s Defence of the *Nicene* Faith is promiſed, which has ſince been publiſhed with Dr *Whitby*'s Name. See below (No. 34.)

The Preface obſerves, that this Adverſary of Dr *Clarke*'s (Mr *N*'s Friend,) muſt be allowed to have a competent Acquaintance with the Writings of the Antient Fathers, and is therefore conſidered by this Author: But that the Writer of ' The Remarks by the Author of ſome Conſiderations ' ſeems to know very little of Antiquity, fights with his Eyes ſhut, going wholly upon an Hypotheſis with-

without any regard to the Tenor either of Scripture or Antiquity.

IX. 'The Difficulties and Diſcouragements which attend 'the Study of the Scriptures in the way of private 'Judgment.

In 1716, a 7th Edit. of it was publiſhed, in which there is added in the Title Page, the Words following:

'In order to ſhew, that, ſince ſuch a Study of the 'Scriptures is Men's indiſpenſible Duty, it concerns 'all Chriſtian Societies to remove (as much as poſ-'ſible) ſuch Diſcouragements. To which is annex-'ed the Cenſure of the Lower Houſe of Convoca-'tion on this Book: And a Letter written by Mr '*Hales* of *Eaton* to Abp *Laud*, upon occaſion of 'his *Tract concerning Schiſm*, never before printed.

This Pamphlet uſed to be called Dr *H*---'s; but ſince his famous Sermon on Church-Authority, People are more cautious of laying this to his Charge.

Of the Interpoſition of the Convocation, when the Controverſy was gone thus far, a full Account is publiſhed in

X. 'An Apology for Dr *Clarke*, containing an Ac-'count of the late Proceedings in Convocation up-'on his Writings concerning the Trinity. Being 'a Collection of ſeveral Original Papers, *viz.*

'1. The Complaint of the Lower Houſe, *June* '2. 1714.

'2. The Anſwer of the Biſhops, *June* 4.

'3. Their Meſſage directing an Extract, *Jun.* 12.

'4. The Extract by the Lower-Houſe, *June* 23.

'5. Dr *Clarke*'s Reply to it, *June* 26.

'6. A Paper laid by Dr *Clarke* before the Biſh-'ops, *July* 2.

'7. A Letter to Dr *Cl.* occaſioned by it.

'8. Part of his Anſwer.

'9. A Paper from Dr *Cl.* delivered to the Bp 'of *London*, *July* 5.

'10. The Reſolution of the Upper Houſe, *July* 5.

'11. The Reſolution of the Lower Houſe, *July* 7.

'Publiſhed by the Author of the abovementioned 'Letter to Dr *Clarke*.

About the ſame time was publiſhed

XI. ‘ A full Account of the late Proceedings in Convo-
‘ cation relating to Dr *Clarke*'s Writings about the
‘ Trinity, containing true Copies of ſeveral Origi-
‘ nal Papers ; with ſome ſhort Remarks.

From this time, till the Controverſy breaking out again this laſt Year in the Church, upon occaſion of the Bp of *London*'s Circular Letter ; and among the Diſſenters, by reaſon of the Ejectment of Mr *Pierce* at *Exeter*; the Controverſy went on very moderately, and there were but few Books written concerning it, comparatively to the great Quantities there have been ſince.

In 1714 were theſe following ones :

‘ XII. Reflections upon the preſentControverſy concern-
‘ ing the Holy Trinity, wherein are ſet forth the In-
‘ conveniences of ſome vulgar Explications. In a
‘ Letter from a Clergyman to Dr *Clarke*.

XIII. ‘ Three Letters to Dr *Clarke* from a Clergyman,
‘ concerning his Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity,
‘ with the Doctor's Replies. Publiſhed by the Au-
‘ thor of the ſaid Three Letters.

The firſt of theſe Letters is dated *July* 14. the laſt *Nov.* 1.

XIV. ‘ A Diſſuaſive from Enquiring into the Doctrine
‘ of the Trinity : Or the Difficulties and Diſcourage-
‘ ments which attend the Study of that Doctrine.

This is ſaid to be by Dr *Wh--y*.

XV. ‘ Dr *Clarke*'s Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity ex-
‘ amined. By *Edw. Welchman*, A. M. Licenſed
‘ *Oct.* 13.

XVI. ‘ The Innocency of Error aſſerted and vindicated.
‘ By *Eugenius Philalethes.* ’ Dated *Dec.* 11.

This is ſaid to be Mr. *Sykes*'s. A ſecond Edition of it was publiſhed, dated *Sept.* 23. 1715, with a Preface in Anſwer to Remarks lately made upon it.

XVII. ‘ A Letter to a Friend in *Lancaſhire*, occaſioned
‘ by a Report concerning Injunctions andProhibitions
‘ by Authority, relating to ſome Points of Religion
‘ now in Debate. Dated *Dec.* 15. 1714.

XVIII. ‘ An Explication of the Articles of the Divine
‘ Unity, the Trinity, and Incarnation. By *Stephen*
‘ *Nye*, M. A.

This

This Gentleman had writ on this Subject before Dr *Clarke*.

In the Year 1715 were publiſhed

XIX. 'The True Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity continued and vindicated from the Miſrepreſentations of Dr *Clarke*, in Anſwer to his Reply. By the Author of the Scripure-Doctrine publiſhed and recommended by Mr *Nelſon*. (See above No. 5. and 7.)

XX. 'A Plain Scripture Argument againſt Dr *Clarke*'s Doctrine concerning the Trinity, in a Letter to Him, with ſome previous Letters relating to our Creeds and Forms of Worſhip.

This was written by the late Reverend Mr *R. Mayo*. See the Anſwer to this and the foregoing, in 1719, No. 18.

XXI. 'An Examination of Mr *Nye*'s Explication of the Articles of the Divine Unity, the Trinity and Incarnation. Wherein is briefly ſhewn the Inſufficiency of that Explication, with a Vindication of Dr *Clarke*'s Scripture-Doctrine and Replies from the Charge of Tritheiſm. By *John Jackſon*, Rector of *Roſſington*.

Stand with Clarke

XXII. 'A Full Enquiry into the Original Authority of that Text, 1 *Joh.* v. 7. Containing an Account of Dr *Mills*'s Evidence from Antiquity for and againſt its being Genuine. With an Examination of his Judgment thereupon. By *Tho. Emlyn*. (See below, No. 36, 37, 38.)

XXIII. 'The Supremacy of the Father aſſerted, or Eight Arguments from Scripture to prove that the Son is a Being Inferior and Subordinate, &c. By *Tho. Chubb*. (See below, No. 33.)

This was publiſhed by Mr *Whiſton*.

In the Year 1716 were publiſhed

XXIV. 'A True Account and Confutation of the Doctrine of the *Sabellians*.

XXV. 'The External Peace of the Church, only attainable by a Zeal for Scripture in its juſt Latitude, and by mutual Charity; not by a Pretence of Uniformity of Opinions.

This

This is said to be Mr *Sykes's*.

XXVI. ‘ A Collection of Queries, wherein the moſt ma-
‘ terial Objections from Scripture, Reaſon, and An-
‘ tiquity, which have as yet been alleged againſt Dr
‘ *Clarke*, are propoſed and examined. With an Ap-
‘ pendix; in which are offered ſome Queries, &c.
‘ concerning the vulgar Scholaſtick Explication.

The Queries propoſed are moſt of them Dr *Waterland's*. (See below 1719, No. 17 and 19.) The Anſwerer is ſaid to be Mr *Jackſon*. (See above No. 20.)

In the Year 1717

XXVII. ‘ The Perſonality and Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt
‘ proved. A Sermon preached at *Oxford*, *Feb.* 24.
‘ 1716. By *Will. Stevens*. A. M. (See 1719, No. 20.)

XXVIII. ‘ The Divinity of our Saviour proved in an
‘ Act-Sermon at *Oxford*, *July* 7. 1717. By *Tho.*
‘ *Hind*, A. M.

XXIX. ‘ A Sermon preached before the King on *Chriſt-*
‘ *mas-Day*, 1717. By *Edw.* Ld Bp of *Coventry*.

XXX. ‘ A Diſcourſe of the Trinity in Unity, with an
‘ Examination of Dr *Clarke's* Scripture-Doctrine
‘ of the Trinity. By *Tho. Bennet*, D. D

This Writer, who undertakes to confute Dr *Clarke*, and condemns him of departing from the Eſtabliſhed Faith concerning the Trinity, has himſelf departed much further from it, and advanced ſuch a Scheme, as 'tis very probable never enter'd into the Thoughts of any Perſon, whether Orthodox or Heterodox, before: Which drew upon him Replies from *both* Sides. Mr *Hughes* of *Ware* on the one Side anſwered him in

XXXI. ‘ Remarks on Dr *Bennet's* Diſcourſe of the
‘ Trinity, with a particular Regard to our Saviour's
‘ Divinity. By *John Hughes* of *Ware* in *Hertford-*
‘ *ſhire*.

[Mr, *Hughes* had, before this, writ ‘ An Eſſay on our Saviour's Divinity.]

And Mr *Emlyn* on the other Side,

XXXII. ‘ Dr *Bennet's* New Theory of the Trinity exa-
min'd. By *Tho. Emlyn*.

See alſo in 1719, The Modeſt Plea, and Mr *Stephens's* Sermon. (No. 18 and 20.)

Mr. *Chubb*'s Tract (See No. 22.) had been replied to in a Book written by one *Clagett*, called

XXXIII. ' *Arianiſm Epitomized.*

A Performance which would have been paſſed over in this Account, had it not occaſioned a Reply, entitled,

XXXIV. ' The Supremacy of the Father Vindicated: ' Or Obſervations on Mr *Clagett*'s Book entitled ' *Arianiſm Epitomized* ; in which is ſhewn, that ' what Mr *Clagett* and others call Chriſt's Divine Na- ' ture, is ſo far from being the real and very Son of ' God, that on the contrary it is in reality the very ' Father of God's Son. Wherein likewiſe the per- ' ſonal Union of the Supreme God to the Man Chriſt ' Jeſus, the Quieſcence of the Word, and the Standard ' of the Species of Mankind, are conſider'd. By ' *Tho. Chubb.*

This Year alſo Dr *Whitby* publiſhed his Remarks on Dr *Bull*'s Defence of the *Nicene* Faith, which I have mentioned as promiſed in the Year 1714, (See above, No. 8.) This was alſo referred to before it was printed, in ' The Collection of Queries anſwered.' (See above, No. 25.) It is entitled,

XXXV. ' Diſquiſitiones Modeſtæ in Clariſſimi *Bulli* ' defenſionem Fidei *Nicænæ*. Autore *D. Whitby*, D. ' D.

(See *Waterland*, 1719. No. 17.)

It was not long after this, that there was publiſhed a Tranſlation of a Piece of Bp *Bull*'s, which had never before been printed ſeparately, but only in the Folio Edition of his Latin Works publiſhed by Dr *Grabe*. The Title is,

XXXVI. ' The Divinity of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt pro- ' ved to be the Primitive and Apoſtolick Doctrine ' of the Catholick Church, with a curious Remark ' on the Validity of the *Sibylline* Oracles. By Dr. ' *Geo. Bull*, late Bp of St. *Davids.*

In 1715 Mr *Emlyn* had publiſhed an Enquiry into that diſputed Text, 1 *John* v. 7. (See above No. 21.) This occaſioned a *French* Tract in Defence of the Genuineneſs of that Verſe, which was now tranſlated, *viz.*

XXXVII. ' A Critical Diſſertation on 1 *John*, v. 7. ' Wherein

'Wherein the Authentickneſs of this Text is fully 'proved againſt the Objections of Mr *Simon* and 'the modern *Arians*. Written in *French* by Mr '*Martin* Miniſter of the *French* Church at *Utrecht*.

The Beginning of the next Year (1719.) Mr *Emlyn* reprinted his

XXXVIII. 'Collection of Tracts relating to the Deity, 'Worſhip, &c. of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, *viz.* An 'humble Enquiry into the Scripture-Account of the 'Deity of Jeſus Chriſt, firſt publiſhed, 1702.

'A Vindication of the Worſhip of Chriſt on Uni-'tarian Principles, in 1706.

'The Supreme Deity of God the Father demon-'ſtrated, in 1707, &c.

In this Edition were added,

'A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Diſſenting 'Miniſters in *Dublin* againſt the Author. And

'An Anſwer to Mr *Martin*'s Diſſertation on '1 *John*, v. 7, ſhewing the Inſufficiency of his 'Proofs, and the Errors of his Suppoſitions, &c.

Which I have juſt now mentioned. But no Cauſe, when once undertaken, can be too deſperate to be defended: Therefore in ſome time we had

XXXIX. 'An Examination of Mr *Emlyn*'s Anſwer 'to the Diſſertation on 1 *John*, v. 7. By Mr '*Martin*.

Juſt in the beginning of this Year, was alſo publiſhed a Treatiſe, which, tho' mentioned in the Account of the Bp of *Bangor*'s Controverſy, yet is neceſſary to be mentioned alſo in this; becauſe it belongs equally to both: Treating of two Subjects; 1. Whether Impoſition of any Articles not in Scripture-Words, be warrantable: Which being an Enquiry concerning Church-Authority, properly belongs to the other Controverſy. And 2. Whether the Articles may be ſubſcribed by a Perſon who has Notions concerning the Trinity different from what are vulgarly called Orthodox: Which properly belongs to *This* Controverſy. It is entitled,

XL. 'An Eſſay on Impoſing and Subſcribing Articles 'of Religion: In a Letter to *Phileleutherus Oxo-'nienſis*, by *Phileleutherus Cantabrigienſis*.

Since the re-printing of Mr *Emlyn*'s *Tracts*, there has been alſo re-printed

XLI. ‘ A Vindication of the true Deity of our bleſ-
‘ ſed Saviour, in Anſwer to Mr *Emlyn*. By the
‘ Reverend Mr *Boyſe* of *Dublin*. 3d Edit.

There has been alſo re-printed

XLII. ‘ Certain Propoſitions, by which the Doctrine
‘ of the Holy Trinity is ſo explained according to
‘ the antient Fathers, as to ſpeak it not contradic-
‘ tory to Natural Reaſon. By *Edw.* late Ld Bp
‘ of *Gloceſter*. (Dr *Fowler*.)

Theſe Propoſitions entirely agree with Dr *Clarke*'s Scheme, except that the Bp makes the Son to be a Being *neceſſarily emaning* from the Father, and Dr *Clarke* maintains Him to be derived from the Father by *his Power and Will*.

XLIII. After ſome time was publiſhed, ‘ The 7th Edi-
‘ dition of Mr *Chilingworth*'s Works; in which
‘ were added Two Letters never before publiſhed;
‘ in one of which, he conſiders the Objections a-
‘ gainſt the Subſcriptions required of Church of *En-*
‘ *gland* Miniſters: And in the other he endeavours
‘ to ſhew that the Doctrine of *Arius* is, if not a
‘ Truth, yet at leaſt no damnable Error.

And now come we to the breaking out of this Controverſy with much greater Warmth and Zeal than had been ſhewn in it for ſome time paſt, both in the Eſtabliſhed Church, and among the Diſſenters. Its Renewal in the Eſtabliſhed Church, was occaſioned by the Bp of *London*'s Letter; and among the Diſſenters, by the injurious Treatment of Mr *Pierce* at *Exeter*. Of each of which diſtinctly.

The Occaſion of the Biſhop of *London*'s Letter was this.

The Pſalms in Metre for the Uſe of St *James*'s *Weſtminſter*, were re-printed in 1718, in which ſome Paſſages were left out, and ſome Doxologies altered in this manner,

To God, thro' Chriſt his Son our Lord,
All Glory be therefore, &c.

Great

Great Numbers of these were dispersed before the Alteration was taken notice of by the Society for promoting of Christian Knowledge. But as soon as so Heretical a Doxology in Scripture-Words was observed, this occasioned great Complaints to the Society, that the Faith was going to be subverted, and *Arianism* introduced, by using Scripture-Words in the room of Modern ones.

This it was thought could not better be prevented than by the seasonable Interposition of my Lord Bp of *London*, to forbid the Use of these Doxologies in his Diocese; who accordingly printed all that are marked stand with Whiston's Tracts

I. ' A Letter from the Lord Bishop of *London* to the ' Incumbents ---- in his Diocese, concerning their ' not using any New Forms of Doxology.

This is dated *Dec.* 26. 1718; and presently after, one of his Lordship's Chaplains printed,

II. ' Plain Notions of our Lord's Divinity, set forth ' in a Sermon preached upon *Christmas-Day*, at ' *White-Hall*, by *Tho. Mangey*, L. L. D.

The Bishop's Letter was animadverted upon in

III. ' Mr *Whiston*'s Letter of Thanks to the Bishop of ' *London*, for his late Letter to his Clergy against ' the Use of new Forms of Doxology. *Jan.* 21.

And

IV. ' An humble Apology for St *Paul* and the other ' Apostles, or a Vindication of Them and their ' Doxologies from a Charge of Heresy. By *Cornelius Paets*.

Immediately after Mr *Whiston*'s publishing his above Letter, on *Jan.* 23. the Zeal of the famous Dr *Sacheverell* forced him to turn the old Heretick out of his Church during the time of Divine Service. A plain Relation of it, is to be met with in

V. ' Mr *Whiston*'s Account of Dr *Sacheverell*'s Proceedings in order to exclude him from St *Andrew*'s Church in *Holbourn*.

And presently after, was published an Ironical Treatise entitled,

VI. ' A Defence of the Bishop of *London*, in Answer ' to Mr *Whiston*'s Letter of Thanks, addressed to ' the Arch-Bp of *Canterbury*. To which is added,

' A

' A Vindication of Dr *Sacheverell*'s late Endeavour
' to turn Mr *Whiſton* out of his Church.

To Mr *Whiſton*'s Letter, there were the following Replies.

VII. ' The Lord Biſhop of *L*----'s Letter to his Clergy
' defended: Wherein the conſtant Worſhip of Son
' and Holy Spirit with the Father, during the firſt
' Ages is ſet forth; and the Antiquity of the Dox-
' ology uſed by the Church of *England* aſſerted. By
' a Believer.

This *Believer*, in a very Gentleman-like manner informs his Readers in the Title-Page, that thoſe who are deſirous the Doxologies, which *only* were uſed by the Apoſtles, ſhould be reſtored in the room of Human ones that have been ſubſtituted in their ſtead, are *Infidels* and *Unbelievers*. But 'tis to be hoped he does not mean Unbelievers in Scripture, but Unbelievers in Human Compoſures, which pretend to be authoritative Interpretations of Scripture.

This Trick of aſperſing an Adverſary, and infuſing Prejudices againſt him, by rude and malicious Inſinuations in Title-Pages, is not only practiſed by inferior and anonymous Writers; but, as we ſhall ſee by and by, in the greateſt Champions.

Another Anſwer to Mr *Whiſton* was,

VIII. ' A ſeaſonable Review of Mr *Whiſton*'s Account
' of the Primitive Doxologies in his Letter to the
' Biſhop of *London*. By a Preſbyter of his Lord-
' ſhip's Dioceſs.

To this laſt, Mr *Whiſton* replied in

IX. ' Mr *Whiſton*'s 2d Letter to the R. R. the Ld Bp
' of *L*. concerning the Primitive Doxologies; where-
' in the ſeaſonable Review of his Account of them is
' conſidered.

The Author of the Review, anſwered him in

X. ' A Second Review of Mr *Whiſton*'s Account of the
' Primitive Doxologies occaſioned by his 2d Letter
' to the Biſhop of *London*.

The abovementioned Sermon of Dr *Mangey*, was anſwered in

XI. ' A

—— XI. ‘ A Letter to Dr *Mangey*, occaſioned by his Ser-
‘ mon entitled, *Plain Notions*, &c. By *Phileleuthe-*
‘ *rus Cantabrigienſis*.

Some time after, Dr *Mangey* publiſhed another Sermon on this Subject, entitled,

XII. ‘ The Eternal Exiſtence of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt,
‘ ſet forth in a Sermon preached at the Viſitation
‘ at *Chertſey*, *May* 22. By *Tho. Mangey*, L. L. D.

Which was replyed to in

XIII. ‘ A Second Letter to the Reverend Dr *Mangey*,
‘ occaſioned by his Viſitation Sermon. With a Vin-
‘ dication of *Phileleutherus Cantabrigienſis*'s Let-
‘ ter to him. By a Seeker after Truth.

About this time, upon occaſion of the Bill for Repealing the Occaſional and Schiſm-Acts, there was a Debate in the Houſe of Lords concerning impoſing a New Teſt about the Trinity; for which the E. of *Nott-----m* expreſſed his Zeal. His Lordſhip's Chaplain alſo publiſhed a Tract on this Subject, entitled,

XIV. ‘ The Divinity of our Saviour proved: In an
‘ Eſſay on the Eternity of the Son of God. By *Tho.*
‘ *Seaton*, M. A. Fellow of *Clare-Hall* in *Cambridge*,
‘ and Chaplain to the Rt. Honourable the Earl of
‘ *Nottingham*.

On theſe Accounts Mr *Whiſton* publiſhed,

XV. ‘ A Letter to the Right Honourable the Earl of
‘ *Nottingham*, concerning the Eternity of the Son of
‘ God, and the Holy Spirit. By *W. Whiſton*, A. M.

Since this, hath been publiſhed

XVI. ‘ An Examination of Dr *Clarke*'s Scripture-
‘ Doctrine of the Trinity, with a Confutation of
‘ it. By *Valentine Haywood*, M. A.

Proceed we now to more conſiderable Books concerning this Controverſy, than what have already been mentioned this Year.

Dr *Clarke* publiſhed a ſecond Edition of

XVII. ‘ The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, where-
‘ in every Text of the New Teſtament relating to
‘ that Doctrine is diſtinctly conſidered; and the Di-
‘ vinity of our bleſſed Saviour, according to the
‘ Scriptures, proved and explained.

In

In this Edition are ſeveral Alterations, Tranſpoſitions, Additions and Omiſſions. Particularly the Comments on the *Athanaſian* Creed, on the Beginning of the Litany, and on ſome other Paſſages in the Common-Prayer, are omitted; and inſtead thereof, it is only ſaid in general, that when any Perſon uſes theſe Expreſſions, he is obliged to underſtand them in ſuch a Senſe, as may be conſiſtent with the Expreſſions before-cited (from the Common-Prayer in *P.* 3. *Ch.* 1. and from Scripture in *P.* 1.)

And certainly it is but reaſonable, that if it ſo happens, that in Eſtabliſhed Forms there are Expreſſions, which, taking each in the moſt obvious Senſe, contradict one another; the leſſer Number, and thoſe unſcriptural ones, ſhould be underſtood in a Senſe not the moſt obvious, to reconcile them to the greater Number; and not the greater Number, and thoſe too Scriptural ones, in a Senſe not the moſt obvious, to reconcile them to the leſſer.

In this Edition, References are in many Places added to Dr *Bennet*'s Book; in which Dr *Clarke*'s Senſe of moſt of the Texts of Scripture, is very much confirmed, either by his agreeing to it, or by his manner of oppoſing it.

In a few Days ater this, Dr *Waterland* publiſhed,

XVIII. ‘ A Vindication of Chriſt's Divinity: Being ‘ a Defence of ſome Queries relating to Dr *Clarke*'s ‘ Scheme of the Holy Trinity. By *Dan. Water-* ‘ *land*, D. D.

The charitable Inſinuation in the Motto of the Title-Page, is very remarkable: It is,

Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὃν σὺ διώκεις. σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν. Acts 9. 5.

This is the Way of Some: Which their Adverſaries do not envy them.

There are in this Book ſome Animadverſions on Dr *Whitby*'s *Diſquiſitiones in* Bulli *Defenſionem Fidei* Nicænæ.

The

The Doctor's own Scheme of the Trinity, which he defends in oppoſition to Dr *Clarke*'s, is expreſſed in *P.* 350.

'By Perſon ---- I certainly mean a *real Perſon*, 'an Hypoſtaſis, no Mode, Attribute, or Property. --- 'I add, --- *each* Divine Perſon is an individual, 'intelligent Agent: But as ſubſiſting in one un- 'divided Subſtance, they are *All together*, in that 'reſpect, *but One* undivided intelligent Agent.

The Doctor in this Book deſigning only to oppoſe Dr *Clarke*'s Scheme, has taken but little Care to eſtabliſh his own. But This we expect will be done, in his Lectures which are now preaching at St. *Paul*'s againſt Heterodox Opinions in the Article of the Trinity, after the Method of Mr *Boyle*'s Lectures againſt Atheiſts and Deiſts.

Dr *Waterland*, in a *Preface* and *P.S.* to his Book, takes notice of ſome Alterations in Dr *Clarke*'s Second Edition of his Scripture Doctrine.

That moſt inſiſted on is, the omiſſion of theſe Words in the Introduction:

'Tis plain that every Perſon may reaſonably a- 'gree to ſuch Forms, whenever he can in any Senſe 'at all reconcile them with Scripture.

I know not for what reaſon Dr *Clarke* omitted theſe Words; but I believe I may ſay, it was not for the Reaſon Dr *Waterland* inſinuates, *viz. That ſuch Subſcription is not juſtifiable*; becauſe the ſame Thing is ſtill aſſerted five or ſix times at leaſt in the Introduction as corrected in the New Edition. See below what will be ſaid on the Bp of *Oxford*'s Charge.

Dr *Waterland*'s Book had not been long publiſhed, when there came out

XIX. 'A modeſt Plea for the Baptiſmal and Scripture 'Notion of the Trinity, wherein the Schemes of 'the Reverend Dr *Bennet* and Dr *Clarke* are com- 'pared. Alſo Two Letters: One written to the late 'Reverend Mr *Mayo*, concerning his Plain Scrip- 'ture Argument; the Other to the Author of a

'Book entitled, The True Scripture Doctrine of the 'Trinity continued and vindicated. By a Clergy-'man in the Country.

The three Tracts which are anſwered in this, have been mentioned above.

Some Months after it had been publiſhed, there was a Second Edition of it, in which was added

XX. 'The modeſt Plea continued: Or a Brief and 'Diſtinct Anſwer to Dr *Waterland*'s Queries.

The Motto to this, in Reply to Dr *Waterland*'s Motto, is,

Μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ, ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας. τοὐναντίον δὲ εὐλογοῦντες. 1 Pet. 3. 9.

This is the moſt conciſe and home, of any Tract that has been publiſhed on this Subject: And might it but be duly conſidered, would render unneceſſary the Performance of what is promiſed in an Advertiſement at the End of it, that there will in ſome time be publiſhed a Large and Particular Anſwer to Dr *Waterland*'s Defence of his Queries.

About this time a Pamphlet was publiſhed, entitled,

XXI. 'The True Hiſtory of the Great St *Athanaſius*, 'and of his famous Creed.

At the Bp of *Oxford*'s Viſitation this Year, this controverted Point was handled both in his Lp's Charge, and in a Viſitation Sermon. The Sermon is entitled

XXII. 'The Catholick Doctrine concerning the 'Union of the Two Natures in the One Perſon of 'Chriſt, Stated and Vindicated. A Sermon preach-'ed at the Viſitation of the Biſhop of *Oxford* at '*Witney*, *July* 21. 1719. In which alſo Dr *Ben-'net*'s late Notion of the Total Quieſcence of the 'Divine Nature in our Saviour during his Miniſtry 'is conſidered and examined. By *William Ste-'phens*, A. M.

The

The Charge is entitled,

XXIII. ‘ The Biſhop of *Oxford*'s Charge to the Cler-
‘ gy of his Dioceſe at his Viſitation in *July*
‘ 1719.

There is great Warmth in it, but there ſeems to be but little Reaſoning. No Diſtinction is made between Things the moſt different from one another; but Poſitions entirely unlike are confounded in ſuch a manner, as could not but be judged artful and deſigned, if it were done by a Man of another Character. Doing a thing *without remorſe or heſitation*, is jumbled (*p.* 5.) with acting *with Sincerity*, and a Handle from thence taken of charging ſuch Conſequences on my Lord of *Bangor*'s Poſition concerning Sincerity, as Men the moſt averſe to him, who have the leaſt Degree of Fairneſs, freely own do by no means follow from it. How harmleſs muſt thoſe Notions be, to make which exceptionable, 'tis neceſſary in ſuch an *unparallell*'d *manner* (I was going to ſay) to change the Terms? But thus has his Lordſhip been once and again ſerved already. He ſaid our Prayers ought to be *calm and undiſturbed*; and for Theſe harmleſs Words, Dr *Snape* ſubſtituted *cold and lifeleſs*. And now, teaching that Men will be juſtified who act *with Sincerity*, He is repreſented as teaching that they will be juſtified if they do but act *without remorſe or heſitation*.

In the ſame manner are Others too uſed in this Charge. Apologies had been made for Subſcribing to Articles *in any Senſe Agreeable to Scripture*, (which implies, that if the Subſcriber is not ſatisfied they are *in ſome Senſe*, of which the Words are capable, agreeable to Scripture, they cannot be Subſcribed at all: This, an Author who has enlarged upon that Poſition, has expreſſed directly more than once in an *Eſſay* on Subſcribing the Articles.) Yet in this Charge, Subſcribing the Articles *in any Senſe agreeable to Scripture*, and, *ſo far as they are agreeable to Scripture*, (which laſt, any one may do, that is not ſatisfied they are *in any Senſe at all* agreeable to Scripture) are perfectly

confounded (*p.* 13.) as if there were no difference between them; and all the Conſequences which follow from this laſt Way, are charged upon thoſe who defend only the firſt, and have explicitly condemned the other. And this Miſrepreſentation is cloſed (*p.* 16.) with a ſolemn 'Appeal to the Conſcience of every one, 'whether there ever was a more daring and bare-fac'd 'Inſult on the Chriſtian Religion; or rather on the 'common Senſe and common Honeſty of Mankind.'

To what purpoſe is this Warmth, if thoſe whom his Lordſhip accuſes (*p.* 4.) of uſing great Induſtry to revive the *Arian* and *Semi-Arian* Hereſies, have not only never any one of them maintained, but have all of them expreſly condemned Subſcribing of Articles with a Reſervation of *ſo far as they are agreeable to Scripture*: and the other Diſtinction of Subſcribing *in That Senſe in which they are agreeable to Scripture*, be not only free from all the Conſequences charged on that Method which is on all Hands condemned; but alſo is allowed on *all Hands*, and is neceſſary to the Vindication of his Lordſhip's *own* Subſcription? Why is this Practiſe harmleſs as to the *Calviniſtical* Articles, and yet ſo inexcuſable as to the *Athanaſian* ones? How happens it, that ſo great an Outcry is now made againſt defending what has hitherto been always thought defenſible, and conſiſtent both with common Senſe and common Honeſty?

Were Dr *Cudworth*, Biſhops *Taylor* and *Pearſon*, † or A. Bp *Synge*, * who have defended ſuch Subſcription with particular regard to the *Athanaſian* Articles: Or were A. Bp *Laud*, Dr *Bennet*, and many others who have defended ſuch Subſcriptions in general; ever charged with *affronting* (p. 14.) *the Underſtanding or Integrity of their Superiors*; or as trifling in the moſt

† *See them quoted in* Dr Cl. *Scripture-Doctrine.*
* *Plain and eaſy Method*; §. 48.

ſerious

ſerious Affair in the World? Hard Fate! that this Method of Subſcribing, which has hitherto been always allowed, ſhould now on a ſudden be ſo ſeverely condemned as a Shift and Evaſion, (*p.* 12.) a Work of Darkneſs, (*p.* 13.) and any thing that may render it odious to the World! Sure, ſome very miſchievous *Project* is carrying on, that Men will rather condemn *Themſelves*, than let *Others* be juſtified *with Them*! What this *Project* is, his Lordſhip has told us, (*p.* 4.) It is 'to unite almoſt all other Sects of Chriſtians, however they may differ from one another as to Opinion, 'in the ſame viſible Communion with the Profeſſors of 'the *Arian* and *Semiarian* Hereſies.' And ſuppoſe there were ſuch a Deſign; where would be the Harm of comprehending *all thoſe who come to God thro' Chriſt* in one *viſible* Communion, as they are doubtleſs comprehended in one *inviſible* One. This is what I thought all good Men had wiſhed for; that the different Parties of Chriſtians would not on any Side lay ſo much Weight on their *peculiar* and *diſtinguiſhing* Opinions, as to exclude thoſe from their Communion, whom they piouſly preſume their common Maſter does not exclude from Communion with him? Will the Bp of *Oxford* ſay, that thoſe who differ from him in theſe Matters, are not Chriſtians, nor in Communion with Chriſt? If he will not ſay this, where is the Harm of other Chriſtians joyning in viſible Communion with them? Why, it ſeems, if This be allowed, then 'inſtead of refuſing to receive Hereticks into our Houſes, or to bid them God ſpeed, we muſt pray with them, 'and partake with them of the Lord's Table, and aſſociate together in all other Parts of Religious Worſhip; and thoſe alone will be reputed Schiſmaticks, who 'ſeparate themſelves from the Communion of Hereticks.' And where is the Harm of Praying, and Communicating, and Aſſociating in Religious Worſhip, with thoſe whom we dare not declare to be out of Communion with Chriſt? Would St *John* have made any doubt, whether thoſe were not to be declared out of Communion with Chriſt, whom he directs us *not to receive*

into

into our Houſes, nor to *bid them God ſpeed?* How then is his Precept applicable to thoſe, of whom we own we ought charitably to preſume they are in Communion with Chriſt? 'But ſhould this Deſign prevail, thoſe 'alone will be reputed Schiſmaticks, who ſeparate them-'ſelves from the Communion of Hereticks.' Truly, now I underſtand what is meant by a Heretick, (*viz.* not one Self-condemned, not one whom we can declare to be out of Communion with Chriſt, but only one who differs from us in Opinion as to ſome ſpeculative Points, but agrees with us in worſhipping God thro' Chriſt,) I ſee no great Harm in *That* neither. All who worſhip God thro' Chriſt as their Mediator, whatever their Sentiments may be of his Nature or Perſonality, whether they revere as myſterious, or pity as unintelligible the unſcriptural Terms and Metaphyſicks of the Schools, may and ought to form but one Communion. And whoever does what muſt neceſſarily break them into different Communions, make them uncharitable, and refuſe to aſſociate either in publick or private, and break off the Chriſtian Intercourſe of joynt Prayers, or mutual good Wiſhes; is an errant Schiſmatick. Such an one may cover, as artfully as he can, his Schiſmatical Breach of Peace and Communion and Love among Chriſtians, by throwing out the odious Name of Heretick, or any other reproachful Terms of uncertain Signification; but he is ſtill a downright Schiſmatick, and deſerves the Title of Heretick much better than thoſe to whom he gives it. The Sin of Hereticating and Separating from (or, which is the ſame Thing, making Separation neceſſary to) thoſe, whom Men differ from in Points not expreſly determined in Scripture; is a much greater Hereſy, than any Opinion concerning the Nature of Chriſt, which they, who worſhip God thro' Him as their Mediator, can embrace. I cannot but think a Deſign of comprehending all ſuch in One Communion, without ſuffering any Differences, which are conſiſtent with all Sides praying *thro' Chriſt*, to hinder them from agreeing not only in a *common Charity*, but in a *common Wor-*

ſhip

ſhip of God; is a Chriſtian and commendable Deſign: And if any Perſons are labouring to bring it to paſs, I wiſh them better Succeſs than I fear they will meet with.

A Deſign this! truly Pious, and highly deſerving Approbation, however it may be ſo dreſſed up in an artful Turn of Words, as to appear invidious, and the blind and ignorant Zeal of a prejudiced Party be work'd up againſt it. Things however excellent in themſelves, may be ſet in ſuch a Light, that ſhallow ſuperficial Readers ſhall be made to believe them very Miſchievous or Cenſurable. No doubt, many Readers of this Charge will think there was a great deal of Hurt in that innocent Saying of *Socinus* mentioned in it, *p.* 12. that had the Word *Satisfaction* been found in Scripture, He could have contrived ſome Way to evade it, [have ſhewn that it was not there uſed in the *Senſe* of his *Adverſaries*] becauſe *Their* Doctrine ſeemed *to Him* inconſiſtent with Reaſon.

How little regard had This *Socinus* for the Scriptures, will ſome Readers ſay? What a Noſe of Wax does he make of them? That if the very Word *Satisfaction* had been there, He ſhould not have immediately allowed it was uſed in the *Senſe* his *Adverſaries* put upon that Word; becauſe he thought it inconſiſtent with Reaſon! And yet *what* ſhould *Socinus* do in this Caſe? Here's a Doctrine taught by ſome Men concerning the Satisfaction of Chriſt, that He thinks inconſiſtent with Reaſon. And ſuppoſe it had happen'd that the Word *Satisfaction* had been in Scripture. Should *Socinus* now neceſſarily conclude, that it was There uſed in the *Senſe* of his *Adverſaries*? The Conſequence of this, muſt have been to deny the Truth of Scripture; ſince what is inconſiſtent with Reaſon, cannot be true, let it be where it will. But if inſtead of this, *Socinus* ſhould examine, whether the Word was not uſed in Scripture in a *different Senſe* from that of his *Adverſaries*, in order to ſhew Scripture was not inconſiſtent with Reaſon; this would only prove that He had a great Veneration for Scripture, and was not willing eaſily to be

per-

perſuaded it was falſe. Had the Word *Trinity* been in Scripture, I ſhould have acted juſt in this manner. ——

But I tranſgreſs the Bounds allowed for a Digreſſion of this Kind, in an Account of this Nature. But being come to the End of this Head of the Account, and to a Performance, the Anſwer whereto is not yet publiſhed; I ſhall be the more eaſily excuſed.

A N

A N

ACCOUNT, &c.

All that are marked stand with the Dissenters Tracts

I COME now to the Share the Dissenters have had in this Controversy. The Suspicions some had entertain'd against Mr *Pierce* at *Exeter*, and the Methods taken to force him, after the Example of the *Inquisition*, to declare openly what he thought better concealed, were what *chiefly* engaged the Dissenters so warmly in this Contest: Tho' there were other Instances not at all influenced by this, in which those Gentlemen who had so loudly complained of the Popish Spirit of Imposition, Persecution, and Calumny, when their Body were Sufferers, had shewn they had their Share of that same Spirit among themselves.

In *Sept.* 1718, upon several Rumours that Mr *Pierce*, Mr *Hallet*, and some others (who cautiously avoided meddling with such disputable Points as that of the Trinity,) were, as their Enemies call'd it, turn'd *Arians*; the Assembly of united Ministers of *Devon* and *Cornwal*, resolved, by imposing a Test concerning this Article on their Members, to extort from the Gentlemen they suspected, those Sentiments which they

were willing ſhould lye hid in their own Breaſts. Mr *Pierce* in his *Weſtern Inquiſition* (ſee No 20.) has given a full Account of the Proceedings of this Aſſembly. After it was over, Mr *Huddy* preach'd them a Sermon, for which a Motion being made according to Cuſtom to thank him, it was refuſed by a Majority, and fearful Outcries made againſt the Sermon; which conſtrained Mr *Huddy* to print it. It is entitled,

1. 'A Sermon preached at *Exon*, *Sept.* 9. 1718, at 'a Meeting of the United Miniſters of *Devon* and '*Cornwal*. By *Matthew Huddy*.

The next Day but one, there was another Sermon as uſual, which gave no leſs Offence than the firſt, and which the Preacher was forced to Print alſo in his own Defence, to ſhew how unreaſonable the Clamours raiſed againſt him were. 'Tis entitled,

2. 'The Miſchief of Raſh and Uncharitable Judging. 'A Sermon preached at *Exon*, *Sept.* 11. 1718. By '*Iſaac Gilling*.

And ſoon after the Aſſembly, ſome Lay-hand, as 'tis thought, printed a Pamphlet, entitled,

3. 'The Innocent Vindicated: Or thoſe falſely called '*Arians* Defended, by a few plain Texts of Scrip- 'ture, from the wicked Aſperſions of uncharitable 'Men, who are Wiſe above what is written.

In the Second Edition was added an Appendix, containing ſome Queries propounded to Mr *Walrond*.

By way of Antidote to this, ſome-body publiſhed

4. 'Mr *Troſſe*'s Catechiſm.

Wherein were contained ſome ſevere Reflections on thoſe who differed from him. And to this Scrap of a Poſthumous Work, the Publiſher added a *P S.* reflecting on Mr *Pierce*'s Declaration in the Aſſembly. In *December* were publiſhed

5. 'An Anſwer to Mr *Troſſe*.

6. 'A Letter to a Diſſenter in *Exeter*, occaſioned 'by the late Heats in thoſe Parts.

Theſe

These Two, with *The Innocent Vindicated*, were very violently condemned by the Orthodox at *Exeter*: And to prevent the Contagion of them, ſome-body publiſhed

7. '*Arius* Detected and Confuted: Or a Direction 'for Plain Chriſtians that love the Lord Jeſus, 'and hearken to his Voice, how to underſtand the 'Language of the Diſciples of *Arius*, &c.

This was publiſhed in *March* 1719, juſt at the time of Mr *Pierce*'s Ejectment. In a Second Edition are added ſome Remarks on two Pamphlets in Anſwer to it, by the Author of the Letter to a Diſſenter in *Exeter*, entitled,

8. 'Plain Chriſtianity defended. Part 1 and 2.

Againſt the Anſwer to Mr *Troſſe*'s Catechiſm, there was alſo publiſhed,

9. 'A Vindication of Mr *Troſſe* from the Charge of 'Uncharitableneſs. Proving by Ten Arguments 'grounded upon many plain and full Texts of Scripture, that the Doctrine of the Trinity and true 'Deity of Jeſus Chriſt is Fundamental. By *Joſiah* '*Eveleigh*.

And againſt the Letter to a Diſſenter,

10. 'A Calm Defence of the Deity of Jeſus Chriſt: 'With Remarks on a Letter to a Diſſenter in *Exeter* by Mr *Moor* of *Tiverton*.

Of the Ejectment of Mr *Pierce* in *March* 1719, a Plain Narrative is given in

11. 'The Caſe of the Miniſters ejected at *Exon*. By '*James Pierce*, one of them.

To which a Reply was printed, entitled,

12. 'An Account of the Reaſons why many Citizens 'of *Exon* have withdrawn from the Miniſtries of 'Mr *Hallet* and Mr *Pierce*. Publiſhed by Order of 'the Committee, [who ejected them.] With a 'PS. by *Joſ. Eveleigh*.

See an Anſwer to the *PS*. No. 37. To the Account of the Reaſons, Mr *Pierce* anſwered in

13. ‘ A Defence of the Caſe of the Miniſters ejected ‘ at *Exon.* By *James Pierce.*

And about the ſame time he printed

14. ‘ The Evil and Cure of Diviſions. A Sermon ‘ preached at *Exon* at the Opening of a New ‘ Meeting-Houſe, *Mar.* 15. 1719. Being the firſt ‘ Lord's-Day after the Ejectment of the Miniſters. ‘ By *Ja. Pierce.*

After ſome time the Ejecters replyed in

15. ‘ A Defence of the Account, in Anſwer to Mr ‘ *Pierce*'s Defence of the Caſe.

This was anſwered in

16. ‘ A Juſtification of the Caſe of the Miniſters ‘ ejected at *Exon.* By *Jam. Pierce.* And

17. ‘ Reflections on the Defence of the Account. By ‘ *Joſ. Hallet.*

Mr *Hallet* had, before this, publiſhed

18. ‘ The Belief of the Subordination of the Son of ‘ God to his Father, no Characteriſtick of an ‘ *Arian.*

Immediately after which, came out

19. ‘ A Caution againſt Deceivers with Reſpect to the ‘ Subordination.

In Anſwer to which, Mr *Hallet* publiſhed a ſhort Letter the ſame Week. This Subject is more at large treared of by Mr *Pierce* in

‘ 20. ‘ The *Weſtern Inquiſition* : Or a Relation of ‘ the Controverſy which has been lately among the ‘ Diſſenters in the Weſt of *England.* By *Ja.* ‘ *Pierce.*

This gives a full Account of whatever was done at, before, and after the *September-Aſſembly*, till the Ejectment in *March* : All the Tranſactions after which Time, are treated of in Mr *Pierce*'s other Pamphlets.

It contains alſo ſome Account of the Uſage ſome other Miniſters in the *Weſt* have met with from their Brethren; as Mr *Cox* of *King's-Bridge* ; Mr *Gilling* of *Newton-Abbot* ; Mr *John Force*, Miniſter of *Bovey* ; and Mr *Nathaniel Cock* of *Biddiford.* There are alſo ſome Remarks in it on what was done in another

ther Aſſembly in *May* 1719: By whoſe Order was publiſhed,

21. 'A True Account of what was tranſacted in the 'Aſſembly met at *Exon*, *May* 5, 6. 1719.

On which alſo Mr *Pierce* made ſome Remarks diſtinctly, entitled,

22. 'Remarks on the Account of what was tranſact-'ed in the Aſſembly at *Exon*, lately publiſhed by 'their Order. By *Ja. Pierce.*

And Mr *Jacomb*, whom that Aſſembly refuſed to Ordain, on a Profeſſion of his Faith in Scripture-Words, replied to that Part of the Account that related to him, in

23. 'A particular Account of the Proceedings of 'the Aſſembly at *Exon*, *May* 6. upon Mr *Ja-'comb*'s offering a Confeſſion of Faith in Scripture-'Words in order to his Ordination. By *Geo. Ja-'comb.*

On *May* 7th, the Day after this Aſſembly, the Lecture was preached by Mr *Carkeet*, which he printed, and entitled,

24. 'Goſpel-Worthineſs ſtated, in a Sermon preached 'in *Exon*, *May* 7. 1719. By *Sam. Carkeet.*

To Mr *Pierce* and Mr *Jacomb*, Mr *Enty* replied, in

25. 'A Defence of the Proceedings of the late Aſ-'ſembly at *Exon*, in Reply to Mr *Pierce*'s Re-'marks. With ſome Animadverſions on a Paper 'Subſcribed by Mr *P.* &c. And a *P.S.* in Anſwer 'to Mr *Jacomb.* By *John Enty.*

In Anſwer to this, were publiſhed

26. 'An Anſwer to Mr *Enty*'s Defence. By *Ja.* 'Pierce.

27. 'Propoſitions relating to the Controverſy among 'the Diſſenters in the *Weſt*, concerning the Trini-'ty, in a Letter to Mr. *Enty.*

Before the *September-Aſſembly*, in 1719, was preached

28. 'The

28. ‘ The Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt proved from the ‘ Words of *Thomas*; *My Lord and my God.* A ‘ Sermon preached at *Exon*, *Sept.* 9. 1719. Pub- ‘ liſhed at the Requeſt of many of the Auditory. ‘ By *W. Palke.*

And now, before I proceed to give an Account of the Tranſactions at *London*, proceeding from theſe Differences in the *Weſt*; I ſhall mention one or two Facts previous, which may ſerve to ſhew a little the Temper the Diſſenters in Town were in before-hand.

Of Mr *Tomkins*'s Ejectment at *Stoke-Newington*, and ſubſequent Treatment, he has himſelf given an Account in

29. ‘ The Caſe of Mr *Martin Tomkins.* Being an ‘ Account of the Proceedings of the Diſſenting ‘ Congregation at *Stoke-Newington*, upon occaſion ‘ of a Sermon preached by him, *July* 13. 1718.

Mr. *Bragg*, Paſtor of a Diſſenting Congregation, cited before him a Member, on Suppoſition of his entertaining Opinions he did not approve; and for want of his giving Satisfaction, excluded him from Communion.

Dr *C*----, who as a Scholar and a well-bred Man, ſtands foremoſt among the Diſſenters, yet he in a publick Lecture, *Jan.* 13. 1719. as if he thought it beſt to begin with Men's Characters, rather than their Arguments, threw out very ungentleman-like Cenſures and angry Reproaches on Mr *Emlyn.*

Theſe, and other Inſtances of Bitterneſs of the Diſſenters to one another, juſt at the Time when they expected and obtained Relief from Oppreſſion for their whole Body, were too juſtly expoſed in a Pamphlet, called

30. ‘ The Conduct of the Diſſenters, in a Letter to ‘ the Lord Biſhop of *Bangor.*

I go on now to mention the Recourſe the Impoſers at *Exeter* had to the Brethren at *London* for Advice, (tho' not coming ſo ſoon as they expected, they proceeded without it) as the chief Occaſion of their meeting at *Salters-Hall*; which was alſo promoted by ſome

on

on behalf of the Government, in hopes of putting a Stop to thoſe Squabbles, and thereby ſaving the Credit of the Legiſlature, who had juſt made an Act in favour of theſe People.

After the Meeting at *Salter*'s-Hall, the firſt Pamphlet publiſhed was,

31. ' An Account of the late Proceedings of the Diſ-
' ſenting Miniſters at *Salters-Hall*, occaſioned by
' the Differences among their Brethren in the Coun-
' try. In a Letter to Dr *Gale*.

To which was added, a *P.S.* againſt the Falſifications of an Account of this Affair given a few Days before in the *Flying-Poſt*. The *Flying-Poſt*'s Account was ſoon vindicated in a ſcurrilous Pamphlet, that, with an aukward Irony, was entitled,

32. ' The Noble Stand: Or, a juſt Vindication of
' thoſe Brave Spirits, who, in the late memorable
' Actions at *Salters-Hall*, got ſo much Honour in
' appearing for that important Principle, " That
" Doctrines only to be known by Revelation, are
" to be ſtated in the Words of Revelation Only,
" when deſigned to be a Standard and Teſt.

And e're long there was a Second Part, called

33. ' The Noble Stand. Part Second. By *Dan. Wil-*
' *cox*.

The Letter to Dr *Gale* was particularly ſevere on Mr *Bradbury*; againſt whom there was alſo another Pamphlet written, entitled, *The Synod*, which produced from him a Letter in a very peculiar Spirit and Style, entitled,

34. An Anſwer to the Reproaches caſt on thoſe Diſ-
' ſenting Miniſters who Subſcribed their Belief of
' the Trinity. In a Letter to *John Barrington-*
' *Shute*, Eſq; By *Tho. Bradbury*.

Some Anſwer was made to it in a ſhort Letter to him, added to the third Edition of the Letter to Dr *Gale*.

We now come to more material and authentick Accounts of the *Salters-Hall* Tranſactions.

The Anti-Subſcribers firſt publiſhed

35. ' An Authentick Account of ſeveral Things done
' and

'and agreed upon by the Diſſenting Miniſters at 'Salters-Hall, *viz.* Advices for Peace: The Letter ſent with Them to *Exeter*; and Reaſons for 'not Subſcribing, as ſome of their Brethren did, 'the Paper offered *March* 3.

The Subſcribers preſently after publiſhed

36. 'A True Relation of ſome Proceedings at *Salters-Hall*, of thoſe Miniſters who Signed, &c. *viz.* 'The Declaration of their Faith; Advices for 'Peace; The Letter from *Exeter* in Anſwer.

To this Mr *Pierce* replyed, in

37. Animadverſions on the True Relation, &c. To 'which is added, a Letter to Mr *Joſ. Eveleigh*, '[in Anſwer to his above, No. 12.] By *Ja.* '*Pierce*.

To this were the following Anſwers.

38. 'A ſober Reply to Mr *Pierce*'s angry and ſcornful Letter. By *Joſ. Eveleigh*.

39. 'A Letter to Mr *Pierce*, in Anſwer to his Animadverſions on the True Relation, &c. as far 'as the *London* Miniſters are concerned in them. 'By one of the Subſcribing Miniſters.

To both theſe he anſwered in

40. 'A Second Letter to Mr *Eveleigh* in Anſwer to 'his Sober Reply. To which is added a Confutation 'of a ſlanderous Report. By *Ja. Pierce*.

41. 'A Letter to a Subſcribing Miniſter in Defence 'of the Animadverſions. By *Ja. Pierce*.

The Subſcribers not only printed an Account of their own, but alſo a Reply to the Authentick Account, entitled,

42. 'A Vindication of the Subſcribing Miniſters, in 'Anſwer to the Authentick Account: Containing, 1. 'Some Reaſons for declaring their Faith at this 'critical Juncture. 2. Why in other than expreſs 'Scripture-Words. 3. An Account of their not Signing the Advices of the other Side. 4. Obſervations on the Declaration of Faith and Reaſons for 'not Signing of the other Side. Publiſhed by the 'Agreement of the Miniſters who Subſcribed.

The Non-Subſcribers anſwered in

43. 'A

43. ‘ A Reply to the Subſcribing Miniſters Reaſons ‘ in their Vindication for declaring their Faith at ‘ this critical Juncture, and in other than expreſs ‘ Scripture-Words. By a Committee of the Non-‘ Subſcribing Miniſters.

44. ‘ A Second Part of a Reply to the Vindication of ‘ the Subſcribing Miniſters, containing a Defence of ‘ the ſeveral Things publiſhed in the Authentick ‘ Account. By a Committee of the Non-Subſcribing ‘ Miniſters.

There was another Anſwer to the Vindication, called

45. ‘ A Charge of Partiality, Impoſition, and Aſſu-‘ ming Authority in Matters of Faith, fixed on the ‘ Subſcribers at *Salters-Hall*; and made good from ‘ what they have offered in their own Vindication.

And in Defence of them was printed

46. ‘ The Unreaſonableneſs of the Charge of Impo-‘ ſition: And the Difference between Creed-making ‘ as practiſed in former Ages, and the Diſſenters late ‘ Conduct in declaring their Faith. By *Tho. Ridgley*.

The Whole of this Affair was ſtated in ſhort, in

47. ‘ An Impartial State of the late Differences at ‘ *Salters-Hall*; with Obſervations, Propoſals, and ‘ Perſuaſives for Accommodation.

The Subſcribers at *London* alſo publiſhed,

48. ‘ A plain and faithful Narrative of the Differences ‘ among the Diſſenters at *Exeter*, relating to the ‘ Trinity, as far as gave Concern to ſome *London* ‘ Miniſters.

Which is largely anſwered in Mr *Pierce*'s *Weſtern Inquiſition*. See above, No. 20.

In Defence of Impoſitions, Mr *Cumming* publiſhed a Sermon entitled,

49. ‘ Advice to Chriſtians to contend for the Faith ‘ once delivered to the Saints. On *Eaſter-Monday*, ‘ 1719. With marginal Strictures, ſhewing, 1. That ‘ the Triumphs of the *Arians* on the Head of the ‘ Generation of the Son, are groundleſs. 2. That ‘ the Characters of Supremacy are applied to our ‘ Lord in Scripture. 3. That Plain Scripture Con-‘ ſequences are to be regarded as Matter of Reve-‘ lation. By *Jo. Cumming*, M. A.

Some Reply was made to this, in

50. 'The Conduct of the Diſſenters conſidered. Part 'Second. Containing, 1. An Account of their Pro-'ceedings ſince the Breach at *Exeter*. 2. Anſwers to 'their chief Arguments for Subſcribing. 3. A De-'fence of the Non-Subſcribers. 4. A Charge of *Po-'pery* upon the Principles of Mr *Cumming*.

The following Anſwer to him is a very ingenious one, and of the firſt Rank among thoſe publiſhed on this Occaſion, *viz.*

51. 'A Letter to Mr *Cumming* concerning the Regard 'which ought to be had to Scripture Conſequences. 'By *John Evans*.

The following Pamphlets alſo are very compleat and maſterly Pieces.

52. 'The Sufficiency and Perfection of the Holy Scrip-'tures, as a Rule of Faith and Manners.

53. 'Seaſonable Advice relating to the preſent Diſputes 'about the Holy Trinity, addreſſed to both contend-'ing Parties.

On the Side of the Subſcribers, were publiſhed

54. 'An Eſſay concerning our Obligations to hold Com-'munion with all that hold the Letter of the Bible: 'Wherein the Arguments for and againſt it, are con-'ſider'd.

And concerning the Queſtion of the Trinity directly:

55. 'The Son's Equality with the Father proved from 'his being the Object of Religious Worſhip. In a 'Diſcourſe on *Heb.* 1. 6. By *G. Burnet*. A. M.

56. 'A Diſcourſe concerning the Neceſſity of Believing 'the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as profeſſed and 'maintained by the Church of *England*, in the Firſt 'of the XXXIX Articles.

57. 'Some Plain and ſhort Arguments from Scripture, 'proving the Lord Jeſus Chriſt to be the Supreme 'God, or one and the ſame God with the Father, 'notwithſtanding his acknowledged Inferiority to 'the Father, with reſpect to his Human Nature and 'Mediatorſhip.

But of the Books written directly on the Queſtion of the Trinity, the moſt remarkable was,

58. 'The Doctrine of the Bleſſed Trinity Stated and 'Defended: By ſome *London* Miniſters. The In-

'tro-

'troduction by Mr *Tong*. Ch. I. By Mr *Robinſon*.
'Ch. II. By Mr *Smith*. Ch. III. By Mr *Reynolds*.

To Mr *Robinſon* in particular, on account of this Performance, and his Conduct at *Salters-Hall*, a Letter was directed, to prove he had formerly Taught what he now Condemned, entitled,

59. 'A Letter to Mr *Robinſon*. Wherein is conſi-
'der'd, the Conſiſtency of his late Conduct at *Salters-*
'*Hall*, with a former Declaration of his own.
'With a *P.S.* concerning the Defence of the Trinity,
'by the *London* Miniſters.

There were beſides publiſhed in Anſwer to theſe Gentlemen, the following excellent Pamphlets:

60. 'A Letter to Mr *Tong*, Mr *Robinſon*, Mr *Smith*,
'and Mr *Reynolds*, occaſioned by the late Differen-
'ces among the Diſſenters. Wherein is conſider'd
'the Regard Diſſenters ought to pay to Human Forms
'in Matters of Faith: With ſome general Remarks
'on their late Book. To which is added, an Appen-
'dix, containing Two Letters ſent by ſome Diſſen-
'ting Gentlemen to their Miniſters: And other
'Papers. [Theſe are *Conſtantine*'s Letter to *Alex-*
'*ander* and *Arius*: And an Account of the Al-
'terations in the Church of *Geneva*, relating to
Subſcribing Articles.] By a Layman.

61. 'An Eſſay to prove that Chriſtians are agreed in
'the ſupreme Object of Worſhip, and may joyn
'together in worſhipping the One God according
'to the Scriptures: With ſome Remarks on a late
'Book publiſhed by four *London* Miniſters.

62. 'The Nature and Conſequences of Enthuſiaſm con-
'ſidered in a Letter to Mr *Tong*, Mr *Robinſon*, &c.

63. 'Remarks on a Book entitled, The Doctrine of the
'Trinity ſtated and defended by four *London* Mini-
'ſters. By *Tho. Emlyn*.

I muſt not forget to add to theſe,

64. 'The Occaſional Paper, Vol. III. No. 11. Being
'an Eſſay to prevent Uncharitable Contentions a-
'bout the Doctrine of the Trinity.

I know of no more Pamphlets worth adding to theſe, publiſhed on this Occaſion, but

65. 'The Conduct of Miniſters, with reſpect to Them-
'ſelves

'ſelves and their Doctrines, conſidered. In a Ser-
'mon at the Ordination of Mr *Morgan* at *Froom*
'in *Somerſetſhire*, *Sept.* 6. 1716. By *Nic. Billingſley.*
'With Mr *Morgan*'s Confeſſion of Faith: And the
'Exhortation at the Cloſe, by Mr *Bowden.* With a
'Preface by Mr *Chandler* of *Bath*, 1719.

66. 'Arguments proving the Deity of the Holy Ghoſt,
'and the moſt conſiderable Objections againſt it an-
'ſwered. By the late Mr *Matt. Poole.*

67. 'Diſputes reviewed. A Sermon preached *July* 23.
'1710. By the late Mr *Matt. Henry.* With a Pre-
'face by the Reverend Mr *J. Watts*, relating to the
'preſent Diſputes. And a Third Edition of

68. 'A Vindication of the true Deity of our bleſ-
'ſed Saviour: In Anſwer to Mr *Emlyn.* By Mr
'*Joſ. Boyſe* of *Dublin.*

It is proper here to take notice, that there are large Extracts of ſeveral of theſe Pamphlets in *Annals*, Year Vth.

I ſhall now finiſh with obſerving, That whatever Bitterneſs, Uncharitableneſs, or Injury either to particular Perſons, or Religion in general, is chargeable on this Controverſy, or any Part of it, muſt be laid at the Door of the Impoſers: Since 'tis *Impoſition*, and That only, which makes Controverſy about Points of this nature unavoidable. 'Tis Confeſſions of Faith in Words of Human Invention, impoſed as Teſts and Standards of Orthodoxy in Chriſtianity, which have almoſt entirely baniſh'd Charity, and Peace and Love from That Holy Profeſſion.

O beatos vos in Domino & Glorioſos, qui Apoſtolicam Fidem in Conſcientiâ retinentes Conſcriptas Fides hucuſq; neſcitis!

Hilarius *de Synodis.*

FINIS.

Page 23. l. 15. for *could* r. *would.*

'*P. S.* The Bp of *B*'s Compleat Anſwer to the Bp of
'*Oxford*'s Charge has been publiſhed ſince the Writing of
'this; which has rendered what has been ſaid in Reply
'to that Charge unneceſſary; tho' perhaps it may be ſtill
'not wholly uſeleſs.

There has been alſo publiſhed,

'An Hiſtorical Enquiry after the Author of the Creed
'called *Athanaſian.* By *Eleutherius Byzantinus.*